

sensitive element 12. The light sensitive element 12 outputs an electrical signal shown in Figure 3 representing the coincidence of the fingerprint patten on the prism 5 and the recorded fingerprint pattern. The valleys 14 in the signal of Figure 3 represent occasions when the rotational movement of the imaged fingerprint pattern coincides closely to the representation of the fingerprint pattern on the recording medium 2.

There are several distinctions that can be drawn between the recitations of present claim 1 and the Blonder patent. First, it does not appear that the photosensitive element 12 actually records a fingerprint, but rather simply outputs an overall measurement of an amount of the light impinging on the light-sensitive element 12. Second, even if one were to assume that the sensor could be replaced with an imaging sensor such as a CCD, the Blonder patent does not teach or suggest evaluating whether a recorded fingerprint originates from a latent fingerprint. There is no disclosure that the undersigned could find in the Blonder patent regarding to this type of evaluation. Instead, the fingerprint of an individual is checked against a prerecorded fingerprint for authenticity. There is no sense that latent fingerprints needed to be checked, particularly since the mechanism for determining fingerprints is a reflective prism 5, the concept of which apparently requires a finger to be present.

More specifically, there is nothing disclosed in any of the sections of the Blonder patent cited in the Office Action that would teach or suggest evaluating whether a recorded fingerprint originates from a latent fingerprint on the sensor, or from a finger placed on the sensor, on the basis of the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor in relation to the integral coordinate system of the sensor.

The Blonder patent is basically an optical comparison of two fingerprints and the net result of the differences is shown on a light-sensitive sensor output as a measure of the coincidence. The undersigned could not identify anything analogous to a mechanism that would measure the location of the recorded fingerprint. The recorded fingerprint is rotated by the scanning elements, but in no sense is its location actually detected.

Further, the sensor is a light-sensitive element unto which two fingerprints are superimposed and therefore there would be no reason to evaluate fingerprints on the basis of location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor in relation to an integral coordinate system on the sensor insofar as it is an analog-based image overlay system.

If the Applicants have misunderstood the Office's position, clarification is respectfully requested. As it stands, however, it does not appear that the Blonder patent anticipates or in any way renders obvious the presently claimed invention. The dependent claims include recitations which further remove the present invention from the applied art, but a discussion thereof will not be belabored for sake of brevity.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Should any residual issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: September 20, 2005

By:



Charles F. Wieland III
Registration No. 33,096

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620